31761 04410 1590

PN
4900
E45W53

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/remarksonjacobin00wharuoft

W5546r

REMARKS

ON THE

JACOBINICAL TENDENCY

OF THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW,

IN A

LETTER

TO

THE EARL OF LONSDALE.

BY

R. WHARTON, ESQ. M. P.

519589
19.3.81

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. HATCHARD,

BOOKSELLER TO HER MAJESTY, OPPOSITE ALBANY,

PICCADILLY.

1809.

blue c/o/2

PN
4900
E45W53

Brettell and Co. Printers,
Marshall-Street, Golden-Square.

LETTER

TO

THE EARL OF LONSDALE.

My Lord,

Though I was not sufficiently sanguine to believe that because Jacobinism had been for some few years withdrawn from public observation in England, it was therefore extinct; yet I did fancy that, after the alarming examples which we have seen in France, it would, whenever any

concurrence of circumstances might contribute to its re-appearance, exhibit itself in a less loathsome and hideous form, and divested of many of the strongest features which distinguished it towards the close of the last century. In this expectation I have been deceived: it is revived, and it comes abroad with undiminished ferocity, with indeed a still more plain and impudent avowal of its real object than it dared to vent in this country during the early stages of the French Revolution. A paper has appeared in the Edinburgh Review (No. 25, Art. 14,) which, under colour of commenting on the work of Don Pedro Cevallos, sounds the old tocsin, and promulgates the worst doctrines in a higher tone, and I fear with higher authority than was ever used by the Philosophers of Anarchy before. Most of them were, it is true, the Apostles of the levelling system, but of all the Apostolical marks they possessed

none except poverty and that species of degradation which arises from contempt; but the plural author of the Edinburgh Review, deriving boldness from the concealment of his or their name or names, and real weight from the habitual surrender of the judgment of individuals to the dogmas of self-constituted censors, fulminates from the Papal chair of democracy, and consigns to everlasting obloquy all who prefer the old scriptures of the Constitution to the legends of Mr. Pain and his followers.

For my part, I should not have attached sufficient importance to such a paper as this Article in the Edinburgh Review to make it the subject of animadversion, if I had not been aware, that from the very circumstance of its being an article in that Review, it would be generally read, and would have a much better chance of receiving an undue deference, than if it had

come forth as the publication of any acknowledged author, and in the common shape of a pamphlet or a volume. Men who have consented to give up the privilege of thinking for themselves on literary subjects, and fallen into a custom of adopting and retailing the opinion of a something or a somebody whom they know not; and to whom from the obscurity in which his real shape is enveloped, they are inclined to attribute more dignity than belongs to him, will not be very scrupulous in extending their confidence in the same oracle, to matters of more serious importance: nay, the writer of the Edinburgh Review seems to have been aware of the imperceptible progress of this sort of infatuation; for he long refrained from holding the language of anarchy; he not only long avoided revealing all the diabolical features of Jacobinism, but did not even put the cloven foot beyond the

hem of his didactic toga: he paved the way for his political guillotine, by accustoming his readers to derive entertainment from the mangled carcasses of unhappy writers: he tried his poison in cases where want of humanity could only be objected to him, before he so far presumed on his power over the public mind as to touch higher matters:

> On mules and dogs th' infection first began;
> He fix'd his vengeful arrows last in man.

But he has at last found himself sufficiently strong to begin a political campaign; and I must do him the justice to say that he opens his operations with a courage and a degree of vigour that shews him to be of a true spirit, and thoroughly competent to carry into effect the utmost extremity of the doctrines which he preaches.

What the sentiments of this undefined

and nameless writer, relative to the British Constitution, to Monarchy, and to Reform, are, may be collected from the following passage:—"The cause of the Spaniards is so obviously that of the people; the desertion of the court and nobles is so manifest; the connexion between the success of the patriots and a radical change of the government is so plainly necessary that whoever has wished well to them feels intimately persuaded that he has been espousing the popular side of the greatest question of the present day; that he has been praying most fervently for the success of the people against their rulers; that he has, in plain terms, as far as in him lay, been a party to revolutionary measures."

Before I proceed to illustrate the real meaning and tendency of this passage, by citing others which either singly or taken together, cannot leave a doubt of its being the writer's wish to inculcate the old Jaco-

bin principles in their fullest extent, I must beg leave to pause, and consider the above words, as they stand insulated, and as they by themselves exhibit a portrait of the ingenuousness and plain dealing of their author.

In the first place, I would call your Lordship's attention to the word "Revolutionary." The Edinburgh Review evidently uses the word *Revolution* as if it had one invariable meaning, like the words *Heat*, *Cold*, *Moisture*, and *Drought*. Now let us see how far he is right:—In the year 1688, we had what has been ever since called a "Revolution" in England. That was begun by an abdication on the part of the reigning monarch after a gross violation of his original contract with his subjects: it was carried on by a convention, assembled with the utmost temper and with a full regard to the law of the land and the forms of the Con-

stitution: it effected a limitation of the Crown according to the strictest notions of hereditary succession, as far as the safety of law and religion permitted under the existing circumstances; it was unaccompanied by any act of violence; it preserved the constituted authorities; it respected all those gradations of rank which are inherent in, and necessary to, civilized society; and all this in an exigence which unquestionably did dissolve the bond between the governor and the governed, and after outrages on the part of the former which had not a parallel in English history. *This* then was a "Revolution." Toward the close of the last century, there was a "Revolution" in France. This was begun under the pretext of some necessary Reforms in the government of that Country; it rapidly produced the destruction of its first movers; it annihilated the government which it professed to amend; it levelled all distinctions

of rank and property; it produced murder in all its shapes, even the murder of the legitimate King himself, upon whom personally no imputation could be thrown: it destroyed all law, it abolished even the semblance of religion, it grew in horrors as it advanced, and at last ended in a despotism as complete as Europe ever witnessed, and as contradictory to every principle of either genuine or spurious liberty. *This* then was a *Revolution!* We have now a third political phenomenon actually before our eyes, which also bears the same name, a 'Revolution.' This consists in a general, nay, almost unanimous, consent of the Spanish *people*, in which word the whole nation is included, *not* to levy war against their legitimate rulers, *but* to throw off a foreign yoke, and repel that enemy who has himself overturned their hereditary throne, and who keeps in captivity their legitimate rulers: so that we have three

distinct states, which are termed revolutionary; a temperate resistance to unconstitutional acts of the Monarch; a lawless, murderous, sacrilegious subversion of every thing that belongs to government and good order; a patriotic defence of a national constitution and regal succession, against the dominion of a foreign power: yet he who may favour any one of these systems of proceeding, is, in the language of the Edinburgh Review, a *revolutionist;* and *revolution* is a "radical change of government;" it is, "the cause of the people against their rulers!"

Let us now consider the passage which I have cited, in another point of view: is it not obvious, that the scheme of the writer is to make use of the general approbation now felt by all good Englishmen for such a revolution as that which is working its way in Spain, to persuade us that we have unknowingly become parties to

"revolutionary measures," and *therefore* may as well go on, and effectuate "a radical change of government" at home.

In an attempt of this sort, the most striking features are, falsehood and perversion; for though we do approve the Spanish Revolution, we have neither felt nor expressed any wish for the radical change of any government, nor for the success of any people against their rulers: and God forbid that we ever should! Our virtues are by this Reviewer twisted into crimes; and we are first told, that we are a little guilty; and then, according to the antient usage of the Devil, we are incited to become more so, on no other pretext than that of Macbeth, as if "returning were as tedious as go o'er." It was an old belief, that the Devil used to draw on his victims from petty crimes to greater crimes, till he made them start with dismay at what they had done, and by

means of their despair, produced their perdition: but the Reviewer has the advantage of the Father of lies, and would bring about the same effects in us, on the foundation of *supposed* preliminary sins: he would persuade us, that we are revolutionists in his sense of the word, because we acknowledge ourselves to be such, in our own: and this at a time when every one who has attained to years of discretion must have the consequences of such "a new order of things," as this Reviewer would have us aid him in furthering (for with the principles he is not ashamed to use the phrases of the Jacobin Philosophers), and all the comparative blessings of an adherence to tried forms, fresh in his mind.

But the Reviewer tells us, in another part of this extraordinary *criticism*, that the enormities of the French Revolution will not occur again, and that we may go

to work with the British Constitution, without fear of being crushed by the ruins. He says, " The *example* of one revolution will prevent a repetition of its enormities in the further progress of the other." Is the Reviewer sure of that? Can he give us security for it? Can he point out to us the exact spot where the advocates of reform will stay their march? Will he warrant, that if those advocates should wish to limit their work, others will not snatch the tools out of their hands? And if he will do this, can he shew us any one stage of the French Revolution, where, if anarchy could have been chained up, a better constitution would have been the result, than that under which we live, and he writes? It is matter of surprise to me, that any writer who enjoys a character of acuteness, should suffer such an assertion to form part of his lure; or how he should be so buoyed up by the vanity of an extensive sale, as

to think that any one of his readers would give him credit to such an extent, except he had himself similar views, and was, from his own principles, prepared to go equal lengths. In the same number of this Review, (there may be many other instances in his later publications of which I am not aware, for till my accidentally meeting with this critique on Cevallos, I have not opened a number of this Review for some time,) I say, in the same number, and in the remarks on the life of Col. Hutchinson, is a panegyric on the Rebellion which ended in the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell: and this we are led to believe, was conducted without any violence, without any ravage, without any oppression. That the misery produced by it, to the country, was infinitely less than that which was generated by the French Revolution, I am very ready to admit: nor do I believe, that if this Reviewer

were to be indulged in his wishes, and a "new order of things" introduced in England at this time, one quarter of the blood would be shed that deluged France during her days of liberty: for however contaminated by French poison, I do not think that this reformer would have the same appetite for murder which distinguishes his Gallican models; nor, if he have, that he would find a sufficient number of blood-hounds in England, for his purpose: but, short of blood, I see no reason to doubt that a "new order of things" here would produce the same consequences as in France. Levelling is the soul of the scheme: the encomium on the Great Rebellion, to which I have alluded, is not the only proof of the Reviewer's opinion respecting the gradations of rank: the Reviewer takes care that we should have no doubt upon the matter: he tells us in plain terms, that he would "reform the Con-

stitution of England," and then immediately discloses the nature of his reformation: he would "reduce the *overgrown* "power of the Crown—he would curb "the *pretensions* of the privileged orders, "in so far as this can be effected without "strengthening the royal influence,— he "would raise up the *power* of real talents "and worth, the *true nobility* of a country "—he would exalt the mass of the Commu-"nity, under the guidance of that *virtual* "*aristocracy*, to direct the councils of "England."

Though he forbears to point out in what particulars the power of the crown is *overgrown;* to what privileges the nobility *pretend*, which they are not *legally entitled*, to enjoy; and who the true nobility are. On these points *He* is silent, but it is easy to supply the chasm: the *whole power* of the *crown* is overgrown; the king ought to be *Rex in purpurâ, in urbe captivus, extra urbem pri-*

vatus: — *All* the privileges of the nobles should be curbed, i. e. abolished; for such an abolition would add no weight of influence to royalty, if the talents and worth of the nation, viz. the Edinburgh Reviewers, and the other jacobin demagogues, were at the same time to be converted into a *virtual aristocracy*, to guide, that is, to *sway* the councils of England, and to take care that the mass of the community should never rise above the level of the guillotine or the gallows. Such is this writer's plan, expressed in plain English; and such is the inevitable consequence to all ranks, of any violation of the degrees which society always establishes for itself. Those gradations are exceedingly minute, extending from the highest to the lowest; and therefore it would be a matter of extreme difficulty to destroy a part without abolishing the whole, without sacrificing one distinction to the caprice of one revo-

lutionist, and another distinction to that of another revolutionist, till the much wished for state of anarchy (the only sure alembick for converting Lazzaroni into governors) should be introduced into the kingdom. The Reviewer, by the expressions which I have above quoted, seems to admit, that it is *example* and not *principle*, which will prevent a repetition of enormity. How does he know what effect that example may have had upon other philosophers? upon the numbers of low factious persons, who do not constitute the people, but the dregs of the people, and who could not find themselves interested in any revolution except such an one as would go the whole length of putting the property and power of the nation under their absolute disposal? It is in the true spirit of Jacobinism that this writer uses the term "people," as opposed to the "Nobles" and "the Court." Does any thinking member of the British

community (not being a revolutionist, in the Reviewer's sense of that word), who has either property or industry, fail to see, that under such a constitution as ours, the King, the Nobles, and the Commons, form altogether one people? Does he not find in every transaction, and in every relation of life, that one uniform interest pervades the whole body, and that the whole must stand or fall together? It is the language of this writer, it is his invidious and groundless distinction between the people, and what he calls *the oligarchy*, that "has had "its day," and not the jealousy with which all England viewed the Corresponding and other similar Societies, as he would induce his disciples to believe. Neither is his distinction between the people and the nobles in Spain better founded: he says, that "not a man of note in Spain was to be "seen in the records of the patriotic pro-"ceedings, until the cause began to flourish, "and then the higher orders came round to

" share in the success." But is this true? Were the first attempts of the Patriots without Commanders? And were not the Commanders men of the higher order? it is doubtless true that the nobles were not the *first* to put on arms; if they had done so, the cause would have been hopeless from the beginning: for I believe that even this redoubtable Reviewer would not venture to appear *in propriâ personâ*, and rally the " people" of England against any existing authority, either legitimate or tyrannical, without seeing good reason to believe that the sense of that people set with a strong current in his favour: and therefore for the Nobles to have exhibited such quixotism as to have begun the resistance to " the new order of things" (if I may venture to use the Reviewer's phrase), would have evinced nothing but a degree of rashness, from which no hope of their ultimate success could have been deduced.

However, the Reviewer does not abso-

lutely confine himself to the vocabulary of the original preachers of sedition: he has the merit, as far as I know, of being the first to transfer from the mis-rule of Robespierre to the administration of Mr. Pitt, that dreaded appellation, " the Reign of Terror;" and in so doing, he is consistent with himself; for he who can confound and identify the Revolution in Spain, and the Revolution in France, so as to infer that the measures and tendency of both must be alike approved or condemned, may well be supposed to identify illegal violence for the destruction of order, and legal restrictions for the prevention of illegal violence. Terror, as a substantive word, implies two parties; the one a cause, the other an object: one party inspiring the Terror, another party upon which that Terror acts. Now we know very well that in France, the tyrant of the day was the Comet which was dreaded; the whole nation, every human creature within the sphere of its influence,

was the object on which the Terror acted: good, bad, and indifferent, were alike affected; for no cunning could avoid, no participation in crimes could disarm, no innocence could blunt, no insignificance was beneath, the fury of revolutionary proscription. But on the other hand, if the administration of Mr. Pitt was a "Reign of Terror," (and a reign of terror on a limited scale it certainly was, to the manifest preservation of these kingdoms,) let us see who were the parties affected: in point of numbers, it would be difficult to calculate the very minute proportion which they bore to the general population of Great Britain; and in point of political consequence, the Terror operated upon a still less body: for, as the vigilance of Government was directed only toward those who carried on correspondence with miscreants whom the Reviewer himself admits to have rendered themselves the declared enemies of human kind, by their enormities; toward

those who wished to subvert the existing Constitution of England; toward those who wished to level all distinctions of rank and property; toward those who wished to overturn the Church of England, and probably erase every vestige of Christian Religion: they only, who fell under one or other of these descriptions could be under the influence of Terror, even while that vigilance was at its height. Exactly upon the same principle upon which the Reviewer identifies the administrations of Mr. Pitt, and the French tyrants, the whole process of our criminal law at the Old Bailey, may be called a "Reign of Terror:" nothing can be more true than that its uniform object is to punish burglary, robbery, forgery, murder, and all other crimes; and that it is, *bonâ fide*, an object of terror to all who commit them: but no reasonable man would therefore liken it to the acts of Robespierre. Before the Reviewer adopt-

ed this term, and gave it the application which seemed good to him, he should have proved what he only presumes, that the community at large was terrified by Mr. Pitt's measures: he should have proved that the persons oppressed, were oppressed for the purpose of overturning the laws of England, and not for the purpose of preserving them; that the principles of Jacobinism are the principles of the Constitution; nay, he should have proved, that the general sense of this country was *with* the revolutionists, and that the old forms and bulwarks of liberty, property, and religion, were kept up through pains and penalties only, against the wish of those, to whom liberty, property, and religion, were of most value. When I say this, I see the answer which the Reviewer will make in the page open before me; he will twit me with his usual elegance of irony, and say, You talk of those who have for-

tunes, and revive the contempt manifested during this "*reign of terror*" "for persons of no consideration, who cannot pledge their fortunes, having only lives and liberties to lose." Does the Reviewer mean to imply, in the words which I have extracted, that those who have fortunes to pledge, have *no* lives and *no* liberties to lose? or does he concede that property may be tenable with life and freedom, but yet that it is a suspicious adjunct to those qualities, and renders the opinion of its possessor on any constitutional point of much less weight than that of one who has all to gain, and nothing to lose, by a revolution? Certainly, if we are compelled to annex the idea of anarchy to the word *revolution*, the possession of property is good cause of challenge to a juror, who is to try the question between Revolution and Stability: but then, industry and all the qualities of social life are equally exceptionable; for the objects

of the one, and the gratifications (and even the very being) of the other, are incompatible with anarchy: so that before we give what the Reviewer would call their due weight to *life* and *liberty*, abstractedly considered, and in opposition to life and liberty, coupled with property, either in possession or in expectancy, we must be prepared to make beggary and profligacy the arbiters of our form of government; the judges of the great question, which is the essence of every such Revolution as the Reviewer contemplates, namely, Whether the wealth and power of the realm shall continue where it is, or be transferred to the very persons whom we shall have delegated to adjudicate upon the matter. The Gentleman however who deems the preservation of Great Britain to have been brought about by a "Reign of Terror," considers that calamitous æra to be now past: in these happy times he says, "We can once more

" utter the words, Liberty and People,
" without starting at the echo of our own
" voices, or looking round the chamber
" for some spy or officer of government."
No man will now, he says, " dare to brand
" his political adversary with the name of
" a Revolutionist, &c. &c.; *these tricks have*
" *had their day*—a day immeasurably dis-
" astrous in its consequences to England
" and to Europe !"

What the disasters produced by *these tricks* to England are, is enveloped in the convenient veil of silence: yet it is not stretching the general import of this criticism very far, to conjecture that the existence of a king, a nobility, a church, and a race of vermin called *landed gentlemen*, constitutes the principal grievance at this day; and this grievance certainly may most justly be attributed to the vigilant administration of Mr. Pitt. But how the disasters of Europe can have a common origin with

this particular and very distinct misfortune of England, I am wholly at a loss to discover: that the disasters of Europe are attributable to the French Revolution, which (as naturally producing a despotism as corruption does a maggot) paved the way for the subversion of every sovereignty that lay within the reach of Buonaparte's ambition, cannot be denied: but by what logic the administration of Mr. Pitt can be put as the cause of that, which is produced by the power of Buonaparte, I cannot imagine; unless it be the same straitforward reasoning and clear perception, that identifies the two Revolutions of France and Spain; or in other words, unless it be that resolute spirit of Jacobinism which forces all circumstances to take a complexion suitable to its designs, and utterly disregards truth, decency, and probability.

I am equally puzzled to account for the confidence with which the Reviewer as-

serts that "these tricks *are all over;*" that the law is gone to sleep, and that villainy may safely come out of its lurking-place. I confess that as far as my observation extends, the contrary has appeared to me to be the fact; that more eyes are open to the escape which we have had; that more hearts are devoutly thankful for our deliverance, than were actually awake to our danger when it existed. Since every day teems with fresh illustrations of the tendency of revolutionary measures, it is reasonable that every day should put us more on our guard against the delusions that make way for them; and I for one have much too good an opinion of the common sense of my countrymen to suppose that even the ipse dixit of an Edinburgh Reviewer, however authoritative may be its tone, will convince one man in a million that the Patriots of Spain have any affinity to the Philosophers of France; or that our assist-

ing them is any thing like a pledge on the part either of the Ministers or of the People (if they must be considered as two distinct interests), to follow up that assistance by assisting the Jacobins at home. It does seem to me that the cause of the Spaniards *is*, what that of the uninfected English *would be*, if the Edinburgh Reviewer were to be in a situation to enforce his opinions at the point of the bayonet; since the tyranny of democracy is not only a natural introduction, but also very similar in its effects, to the tyranny of one: and therefore our assisting the Spaniards to repel him who would impose a government upon them against their will, and to maintain the rights and privileges which *they* revere, evinces no disposition on our parts but to dislike "revolutionary measures," and not at all to wish that "the people should succeed against their rulers:" it is nothing more than a natural consequence

of our dread of fraternization; and as fraternization is an indelible mark of connection with the French system, it is a decisive proof that we do, and I trust ever shall continue, to combat Jacobinism, whether it bellow for liberty or accommodate itself to a despotism of its own creating.

I cannot help thinking that there has been a mistake in the publication of this article, or rather of so much of it (by far the greatest part) as has no relation to the work of Cevallos. I apprehend that the general treatise on the necessity of revolutions, which follows the short critique on the work in question, has been written by some great philosopher, and intended to be produced when the Spaniards should actually revolutionize, as the author, judging from his own feelings, probably had no doubt they would; and that by some unhappy blunder, it was pressed into the light

and tied back to back to the observations on Cevallos, before these unenlightened Patriots had ever thought of any such thing. If no such confusion as this had taken place, I cannot conceive how this writer would have had the effrontery to reason upon the Spaniards rebelling against their legitimate rulers and republicizing their state; how he would have dared to assert that we have committed ourselves to revolutionary measures by even in thought abetting them. The conduct of the Spaniards will bear no such construction: this fact is not only so, but it is a fact so notorious that the dullest cannot be ignorant of it; the most prejudiced cannot be blind to it: so that the whole theory of this Reviewer, built as it is on a foundation absolutely false, would seem too absurd for observation, if the boldness of its doctrines and the dogmatical tone of its assertions might not be supposed capable of dazzling

many who may read them, and keeping out of view the master-lie upon which the present Call to revolution in this country is grounded.

There is in this paper one other, which, though it may be perhaps only a secondary falsehood, is yet pregnant with as much malice as can be expected from any human heart, without the immediate inspiration of Satan. The writer says, " Men of all de-
" scriptions have joined almost unanimously
" in the same patriotic and generous senti-
" ments, and have expressed them loudly
" and manfully. There *may have* existed a
" few wretched intriguers in our government
" —one or two feeble Courtiers or Clerks in
" Office who brooded in the corners of draw-
" ing-rooms and public boards, over gloomy
" apprehensions of their comforts being dis-
" turbed by the progress of the Spanish prin-
" ciples. But if those persons from such
" forebodings, were averse to the cause of

"the Patriots, they never dared raise their "voice against it to the country. They "shuddered in secret at the overthrow of the "worst government in Christendom: in secret "they offered up their prayers that the reform "of abuses might be nipt in the bud by the "success of the French arms, &c. &c." and the Reviewer adds, "A better proof of the "universal prevalence of right feelings upon "the subject of Spain cannot be fancied, "than the profound silence in which all those "wishes have been breathed: not one sigh, "heaved *about Court*, having ever mixed "itself with the general exultation which has "burst from the whole people at the progress "of the Revolution." Here these feeble Courtiers are not only made traitors to the Court, that is to themselves, but stigmatized as the most despicable drivellers, incapable of the least reflection or foresight. For how could any feeble Courtier or Clerk in office deprecate our resistance

to the French arms? Why, if he fear loss of office from a possible revolution, should he wish success to what must in its necessary consequence produce loss of office immediately? But let us consider how these feeble Courtiers are brought to bear upon the subject by the Reviewer: it is done by a sort of grammatical legerdemain: he puts hypothetically the case of these possibly discontented persons, whom, for obvious reasons, he places at Court—for the King and his attendants must, according to the revolutionary creed, be ever opposed in wishes and interests to the People:—he first supposes that "a few wretched intriguers *may* have *existed*;" and then, shuffling the words with admirable dexterity, he produces his feeble Courtiers as *actually existing*; jumps into the indicative mood, and thus, through the rest of the passage, these feeble Courtiers *do* brood, *do* shudder, *do* offer up prayers, and *are* cautious not to

let their thoughts transpire beyond the precincts of *the Court*.

According to the opinion of this Reviewer, any wish contrary to the cause of the Spanish Patriots, must be the offspring of a bad mind. Upon what principle of equity then does he dare to attribute such a wish to any one, without the slightest evidence of its having been entertained? And again, why, if he must suppose such a wish to exist, does he give it *a Court* for its locality, and not *a Cottage?* can he assign the shadow of a reason for supposing it rather to be nourished in the one place than in the other? By what intuition is he made acquainted with a sentiment which is so carefully suppressed, as that not a breath charged with it shall escape? I will tell the Reviewer whence all this arises: his object, his main object is to vilify Kings, their servants and their office; and therefore it is, that having conjured up this wish,

so contrary to the expressed enthusiasm of the nation, he plants it within the precincts of a Court, as a pestilential inmate in a pestilential place; a natural offspring of that corruption and tyranny which must contaminate the abode of royalty. But is there any one who analyzes this passage; who observes the base cunning by which it is interwoven with the context, and the stigma fixed upon Courtiers and official persons, as it were in a parenthesis; and who at the same time sees that these persons are in fact the last who could be reasonably supposed open to the suspicion of entertaining such wishes; and who remarks that the imputation itself grows out of a false image of the Spanish Revolution: who, I say, that reflects on these things, but will agree with me that not one of our philosophizing reformers ever before ventured to obtrude upon the public so im-

pudent a libel, so gross a slander, as this under consideration.

It is with the same view, and with the same defiance of truth and decency, that when the Reviewer observes upon the improbability of Buonaparte's ever subduing the Spaniards into a nation of willing slaves, he carefully excepts Courtiers, whom he admits to be likely to think otherwise. If it be to be contended that self-interest is the hinge upon which every thing turns in a Court, still it is difficult to see what interest a Courtier can have in supposing the possibility of such complete success to the enemies' plans, contrary to reason: but yet it is always a point gained with Jacobinism if a Court can be put in a degrading point of view or made to appear in opposition to the nation *over which*, as the Jacobins say, it tyrannizes, or as I say, *of which* it is a part. If it had suited the Reviewer's pur-

pose to hold up the Spanish Cause for general detestation, he would have charged his feeble Courtiers and Clerks in Office with secretly abetting it; and he would have effected this with as much ease as he has made them secretly adverse: for when regard to truth is laid aside, and a writer is used to invent facts as well as to supply the reasoning on them, he has nothing to do but to consider what set of misrepresentations is best adapted to his purpose, to deliver them with the solemnity of oracles, and to interlard them well with sneers, and the whole business is done.

Though I see much to object to in this Reviewer's intention, I would not be considered as denying his claim to the merit of abilities. The respect which, as an honest man, I must withhold from his heart, I am very ready to pay to his head; and on that account, I feel concern, as well as surprise, at finding myself obliged to im-

pute to him so low a crime, in the scale of literary delinquency, as that of Plagiarism. I should have thought that he would have either had originality of ideas enough in his own mind, or at any rate, have been able to borrow from his coadjutors, sufficient phrases and topics, whereby to vent his bitterness through one article, without being obliged to recur to the stale sarcasms of his predecessors: but it is not so; this writer does actually plume himself with Mr. Thomas Paine's feathers; his genius does not furnish him with any better mode of expressing his hatred to the reigning family, than the old witticism about 'importing a new breed of kings from Germany.' He is not content with stealing this bright thought, but, when stolen, he has used it clumsily, so that it does not look like his own. Mr. Paine applied it boldly, to the present Monarchy of Great Britain; his imitator applies it to Spain,

without once reflecting (for he surely must know) that it would be just as applicable to China or Japan, and that *his* fallacy is palpable; whereas the class of readers to whom the proto-reformer addressed himself, might be supposed to be destitute of so much historico-genealogical information, as was necessary to put the fact alluded to in a clear light. Still, however, I must do the Reviewer the justice to say, that the more this amazing sentence is unconnected with the matter in hand, the more it stands independent of sense and propriety, the greater zeal he shews in the good cause, which he, in common with Mr. Paine, and the rest of them, advocates. The further he goes out of his way to have a sneer at our silly attachment to the Act of Settlement, the Protestant Succession, and such whims as have no better foundation than a love of order, of defined limits of power; and of religion, the better

Champion of Anarchy does he prove himself.

A sneer there was, than which a better could not be devised, to degrade the existing Monarchy of these Kingdoms. The regal character could not be more debased in language, than by being described in terms, which are in ordinary conversation applied to sheep and oxen; and therefore to have pressed this sneer into his service, at any risk of nonsense or incongruity, does seem to give this writer a high claim to the admiration of all Jacobins; and I trust that if there be yet an alehouse where sighs at the stability of our government, and the great prospect of our keeping clear of French fraternity, are ever "breathed in secret," this Reviewer will, at the next meeting of revolutionists, be complimented with "the honours of the sitting."

Such, my Lord, are the principal observations which the criticism on the work of

Cevallos, in the Edinburgh Review, has suggested to my mind, I might have gone much more at large into the subject which it is evidently written to introduce; I might have commented on a great variety of other passages in it, which are pregnant with revolutionary maxims: but it seems enough to remark the design of the Reviewer, and the mode in which he carries it into execution, in order to disappoint him. He has a much stronger enemy to contend with than the laws which he would overturn, and that enemy is common sense. The people of England are not to be cheated into misery by hackneyed and empty declamation; they will be well assured that they have cause to complain before they do complain; they will try every expedient proposed by way of remedy, with the touchstone which has been providentially afforded to us by French experience; and above all, they

will take care that no insidious confounding of French principles with Spanish principles, shall induce them either to adopt the one or to withhold such assistance as may give effect to the other.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

&c.

W. WHARTON.

Beverley, 4th January 1809.

Brettell & Co. Printers,
Marshall-Street, Golden-Square.

BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY J. HATCHARD,

No. 190, Piccadilly,

(Opposite Albany).

---

1. THE ANTI-JACOBIN, OR WEEKLY EXAMINER, 2 vols. 8vo. Price 18*s.* boards.

2. THE POETRY TO DITTO. Price 6*s.* boards.

3. A.B.'s LETTERS TO THE MORNING POST, being a Refutation of Dr. MILNER'S Principles on the Catholic Question.

4. PYE'S SUMMARY OF THE DUTIES OF A JUSTICE OF THE PEACE OUT OF SESSIONS. Price 5*s.* boards.

5. OWEN FELTHAM'S RESOLVES, new Edition, revised by JAMES CUMMING, Esq. Price 9*s.* boards.

6. TREATISE ON INDIGENCE, by P. COLQUHOUN, Esq. Price 7*s.* 6*d.* boards.

7. POEMS by CRABBE, Third Edition. Price 10*s.* 6*d.* boards.

8. WORKS OF EDMUND BURKE, 8 vols. 8vo. boards, Price 2*l.* 16*s.* 0*d.*

9. WEYLAND ON POOR LAWS. Price 8*s.* boards.

10. REPORTS OF THE SOCIETY FOR BETTERING THE CONDITION OF THE POOR, 5 vols. boards, 1*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

11. LORD TEIGNMOUTH'S LIFE OF SIR WILLIAM JONES. 8vo. Price 10*s.* 6*d.* boards.

12. DEDE'S ENGLISH BOTANIST'S COMPANION, Price 4*s.* boards.

13. PLUTARCH'S LIVES, by LANGHORNE, revised by WRANGHAM, 6 vols. 8vo. boards. Price 3*l.* 3*s.* 0*d.*

14. AN ATTEMPT TO SHEW BY WHAT MEANS THE UNITED KINGDOM, AND THE WORLD, MAY BE SAVED FROM SUBJECTION TO FRANCE, WITHOUT THE ABOLITION, IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, OF ALL DISTINCTIONS ON ACCOUNT OF RELIGION. Price 7*s.* 6*d.* boards.

15. JOHNSON'S ENGLISH DICTIONARY, 2 vols. 4to. bound. Price 4*l.* 4*s.* 0*d.*

16. CRUDEN'S CONCORDANCE, bound, Price 1*l.* 13*s.* 0*d.*

17. THE DEFENCE OF OUTPOSTS, (translated from the French.) Price 1*s.*

J. H. has likewise an extensive Variety of the most esteemed Publications, both Historical and Miscellaneous, as well as the most popular Pamphlets.

BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY J. HATCHARD,

187, Piccadilly.

THE JOURNAL OF MRS. PIOZZI,

2 vols. 8vo. 21s. boards.

THE LIFE OF THE HONOURABLE HENRY ERSKINE,

By CAPTAIN THE HONOURABLE THOMAS ERSKINE, late a Commissioner of Stamps, and Author of "Sailor's Letters."

THE LIFE OF WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR,

By the Rev. GEORGE ROBERTS. 8vo. 12s. boards.

THE HISTORY OF THE LIFE, REIGN, AND DEATH OF KING RICHARD THE SECOND,

By THOMAS DE LA MORE, now before first published from the Original Manuscript. 8vo. 12s. boards.

A TREATISE ON THE DISEASES OF THE LIVER,

By THOMAS ANNESLEY, M.D. 8vo. 12s. boards.

A TREATISE ON THE DISEASES OF THE EYE,

By JOHN CUNNINGHAM SAUNDERS. 8vo. 12s. boards.

A TREATISE ON THE DISEASES OF THE EAR,

By JOHN HARRISON CURTIS. 8vo. 12s. boards.

THE HISTORY OF THE ROYAL FAMILY OF FRANCE,

With Anecdotes of the Court of Versailles, previous to the Revolution. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s. boards.

THE HISTORY OF THE ROYAL FAMILY OF FRANCE,

During the Captivity of the Temple. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s. boards.

THE HISTORY OF THE ROYAL FAMILY OF FRANCE,

From the Death of Louis XVI. to the Accession of Louis XVIII. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s. boards.

J. H. has Bibles on various Sizes of Paper, and Prayer-Books, Psalms, Hymns, and Miscellaneous Publications, from the most expensive to the most popular Description.

PN 4900 E45W53

Wharton, Richard
Remarks on the Jacobinical tendency of the Edinburgh Review

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY